DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 288 897 TM 870 678

AUTHOR Rouse, Albert H.
TITLE The Development and Validation of a School Unit Output Model for Recognizing Merit Schools.
PUB DATE Apr 87
NOTE 20p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Washington, DC, April 20-24, 1987). For related documents, see TM 870 679-681.
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Community Surveys; Educational Quality; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation Criteria; Institutional Evaluation; Models; *Outcomes of Education; Productivity; *Program Development; Questionnaires; *Recognition (Achievement); *Rewards; *School Effectiveness; School Surveys
IDENTIFIERS *Cincinnati Public Schools OH; *Design for School Excellence; Effective Schools Research; Excellence in Education

ABSTRACT

The current success and acceptability of the Design for School Excellence (DSE) in the Cincinnati (Ohio) Public Schools is due largely to the seriousness in which the Board of Education and the Superintendent communicated with school employees and the entire community in planning the final outcome of this program. From the original suggestion of a merit pay plan, the Board and administrative team went on to gather information regarding school excellence, school productivity, and merit school characteristics. Reviews of the literature and existing models of school excellence and improvement were considered in depth. A proposal for outside funding was written, but not funded. With input from the entire administrative team of the school system, outcomes regarding achievement, attendance, and attitudes were ranked in order of importance and considered for the DSE. An external review panel of educators accepted these output variables and recommended a broader survey be taken. Some 28,000 parents, students, teachers, and community members were surveyed in March, 1985. Results reported broad support for the DSE. The survey indicated that the types of rewards to be given to merit schools were public recognition, additional funds, some kind of student rewards, and less support for cash bonuses for merit school staffs. (The Community Survey is included.) (KSA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED288897

THE DEVELOPMENT AND VALIDATION OF A SCHOOL UNIT OUTPUT MODEL FOR RECOGNIZING MERIT SCHOOLS

Albert H. Rouse

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

A. H. Rouse

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☑ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Paper presented in the symposium
"Identifying Merit Schools - A Critical Look at
One Model and Five Years of Results"
at the annual meeting of the
American Educational Research Association

Washington D.C., April 1987

TM 870 678

THE DEVELOPMENT AND VALIDATION OF A SCHOOL UNIT OUTPUT MODEL FOR RECOGNIZING MERIT SCHOOLS

A Political Situation Fueled Development

There are a number of strands that could be traced back to get to the beginning of the Merit School Program of the Cincinnati Public Schools. The one action that began the process in a most serious manner was the December, 1981 formal agreement between the Cincinnati Board of Education and the Cincinnati Association of Administrators and Supervisors (CAAS). This agreement stated that before December, 1982, CAAS and "the administrators" would develop a merit pay plan. On November, 1982, after serious study by a 14-member committee of administrators, a merit pay plan was submitted. With that plan, the committee also submitted a list of reasons why the plan should not be implemented. Among the reasons given were that merit pay programs had seemed to work best in medium and smaller districts where there was a relatively high assessed valuation per child and where the school patrons included a large number of professionals and upper-income people. In addition were the usual arguments along the lines that job performance is difficult to measure and that the amount of funds available would not likely allow for sufficiently large pay rewards.

A week later, on November 12, 1982, then Superintendent Dr. James N. Jacobs, made his recommendation to the Board on that administrative merit pay plan.

> "If a merit pay plan were to be put in operation in the Cincinnati Public Schools,...I would support (the CAAS plan) simply because it represents the best thinking of the administrative team representatives who studied this matter over a long period of time. Having said that, I now recommend to the Board and, in fact, urge the Board to reject the plan altogether."

Along with that negative recommendation, Dr. Jacobs submitted in outline an alternative to merit pay. There were two aspects to the plan he outlined; Staff Accountability and the Design for School Excellence (DSE). The current merit school program uses the Design for School Excellence name.

An Administrative Team Structure was Functioning

The administrative team, working through the CAAS organization, gave strong support to Dr. Jacobs' recommendation. Writing to him, they state:

> "Philosophically, the CAAS Executive Committee is in agreement with you to establish a better system of staff accountability and school excellence. In the true spirit of the administrative team concept, we put forth...considerations for the present and anticipate the opportunity to work with you in the development of an effective plan for the future."

Further along in the memo they state:

> "In the long range, the execution of an effective plan will require communication from your office to all employees and to the community..." "And finally, we are convinced you will recognize the process is as important as your projected outcomes."

In hindsight, it was the seriousness with which the Board of Education and particularly Dr. Jacobs took communications with employees and with the entire community, and recognition of the importance of the process to final outcomes that has led to the current degree of success and acceptability of the Design for School Excellence in the Cincinnati Public Schools.

The Board of Education, in November, 1982, accepted Dr. Jacobs' recommendation and shelved any further work on merit pay. They required quarterly progress reports on his alternative proposal. This began a series of meetings to interact with the administrative team to provide and to receive information regarding "school excellence," "school productivity," and "merit school characteristics." As would be expected, extensive review of the literature was carried out, and a number of existing models of school excellence, school

improvement were looked at in some depth. The professional literature of Brookover and Lezotte, of Edmonds and others on effective schools was summarized. The productivity model then being used by the public schools in Columbia, South Carolina was reviewed. More at home, the Ohio Department of Education's program on school improvement and the local goal setting process of the Cincinnati Public Schools were looked at to see their relevance to the merit school program.

Search for Outside Funding Kept Project before Administration, Board, and Community

Through formal presentations and/or site visits, meetings were held with the Appalachian Educational Laboratory (AEL) regarding the Profile of School Excellence (PRO-S/E) instrument they were then validating. The School Improvement Model of the Northwest Area Foundation and the Research Institute for Studies in Education (RISE) at Iowa State University was extensively reviewed with presentations to the entire administrative team of the Cincinnati schools and with site visits to schools in the RISE program by administrative team members. Negotiations were entered into for outside funding of a merit school program. Superintendent Jacobs appointed an advisory committee on Design for School Excellence chaired by the Director of Personnel, Dr. Forrest Orebaugh, to write the proposal for outside funding. The committee consisted of both central office and field administrators. Although funding was never obtained, their work was very visible to local business leaders and the educational community in general.

Output Indicators Initially Selected by Administrative Team (Ad Hoc Committee)

In addition to this advisory committee on Design for School Excellence, Dr. Jacobs directed the Evaluation Branch of the school system to develop the initial output indicators of school excellence. This development was to be

carried out with the advice and direction of an ad hoc committee of instructional supervisors and school principals. It was felt that principals in particular should have their say with regard to the output variables that went into a school merit system. Two workshops involving the entire administrative team were held in 1983. The outcomes of these workshops provided a framework of commonly agreed upon output indicators and the general principles of the measurement dimensions to be considered in developing indicators.

Superintendent's Workshop, February 10, 1983

The purpose of the Superintendent's Workshop was to review the Design for School Excellence Plan as an alternative to a Merit Pay Plan that had previously been considered. Among the workshop sessions of that day were those that provided the administrative staff a chance to review variables or indicators that current research had identified. These included the six indicators that the Richland County School District of Columbia, South Carolina had developed for their "school productivity" model, the eleven variables of school effectiveness used in a model then being developed by the Appalachian Educational Laboratory, the seven factors identified by the Ohio Department of Education and used by our local School Improvement Program, as well as the summaries from Phi Delta Kappan and Educational Leadership on the characteristics of "Effective Schools." These workshop sessions on "outcomes" gave rankings as to the percent agreement in importance of specific outcomes being considered for the Design for School Excellence. To a great degree these outcomes regarding achievement, attendance, and attitudes are the same output indicators still being used. The following was taken from the summary reported back to the administrative staff:

Rank	% Agreeing As To Importance	Outcomes
1	96	(Good) Discipline
2	94	Positive Parent Attitudes/ Community Attitudes
3.5	93	(High) Staff Attendance
3.5	93	Positive Student Attitudes
5	92	Positive Teacher Attitudes
7	91	Reading Achievement
7	91	Math Achievement
7	91	(High) Student Attendance
9	84	Student Interracial Understanding
10	83	Staff Interracial Understanding

Summary

1. For the 81 administrators in the groups at this workshop considering outcomes, the percent of agreement as to the outcome characteristics of effective schools was high with little variability. More specifically, the range of agreement on these characteristics as to their importance was from 83% to 96%.

2. Good discipline, positive parent/community attitudes, positive student attitudes and high staff attendance received the highest amount of agreement as to their importance as outcomes of effective schools.

3. Staff and student interracial understanding were ranked the lowest among the 81 administrators as to their importance as outcomes of effective schools.

4. Based on a 1 (poor) to 3 (excellent) scale, as a group they rated the idea of working toward and implementing a plan that would recognize school Productivity/Achievement and Needs between a good idea and an excellent idea (2.5). Specifically, one participant thought it was a poor idea, 32 a good idea, and 34 an excellent idea.

Superintendent's Workshop, November 10, 1983

This workshop provided an update to the administrative staff. The ten output indicators identified and defined by the ad hoc committee were presented and

discussed. In addition, statements or principles that had evolved in the ad hoc committee regarding the measurement and reporting of the output indicators were presented for small group discussion and response. Appendix A provides a summary of the response sheets that were received from the discussion groups and communicated back to the administrators. Overall, there was general support for the work of the ad hoc output committee and the output indicators being developed.

External Review Panel

The general acceptance of the output variables by the administration made the next step to validation the obtaining of acceptance from the broader community and to obtain additional considerations for further development. On March 14-15, 1984, an external review panel consisting of Dr. Edgar Epps, University of Chicago; Dr. John Newley, Bowling Green University; Dr. Daniel Stufflebeam, Western Michigan University; and Dr. William Webster, Dallas Public Schools reviewed the Design for School Excellence. The members of the Board of Education, specifically the program committee of the Board, were involved in these meetings and had full access to the outside "experts" during their visit. This external review panel provided not only needed outside criticism and recommendations from different viewpoints but also gave needed support and "validation" of the effort to the Board of Education. In their report, the External Review Panel wrote:

> "The panel has been very impressed by the obviously high level of professional dedication and concern for the Cincinnati Public Schools that underlies the present Design for School Excellence. We view the presentation that we have received as consistent with the highest standards of professionalism. We see a real concern for using educational theory and technology to improve the services of the school district and its credibility to its constituents."

Design for School Excellence Community Survey

Among the recommendations of the panel was to broaden the involvement of staff and community beyond that already obtained. To help provide that involvement, in March, 1985, a survey was distributed to some 28,000 parents, students, teachers, administrators, and community members. The survey had been developed by a 19-member advisory committee of parents, Board of Education members, teachers, principals, and community representatives. This committee and its subcommittees met four times from November, 1984 to January, 1985.

In its final form, the survey contained an expanded list of potential school quality indicators. The committee felt strongly that the survey should provide information on the educational priorities of the community in addition to determining the level of community support for identifying merit schools.

The final survey contained four discrete sections. The first section asked the respondents to rate the importance of 37 different factors that had been proposed as characteristics of excellent schools. The factors were presented in four categories: Achievement/Performance, Attendance/Participation, Attitudes and Conditions. Respondents were given the opportunity to add additional factors under each of these four categories. The second section asked the respondents to rate their agreement with the statements concerning the benefits of identifying merit schools and six statements describing the problems associated with identifying merit schools. The third section asked the respondents to indicate whether they supported the public identification of merit schools, and the fourth section asked for input on how merit schools should be rewarded. (See Appendix B.)

A survey section on demographics, established by the Advisory Committee, asked the respondents to give information on their age, race, on whether they had children in public or private schools and on the level of school involvement.

The survey was administered to all teachers and administrators and eleventh grade students in the Cincinnati Public Schools. It was also administered to a 40 percent sample of parents of children in grades K through 12. The survey was mailed to a random sample of of 2,000 residents within the Cincinnati School District, along with a postpaid return envelope. This random sample served as an anchor against which the voluntary responses of other community groups could be compared. The survey was also mailed to all non-staff members of Local School Advisory Committees in the system as well as to a master list of Community Leaders who routinely received mailings from the school system. (See Appendix C for groups and response data.)

The summary of the survey results reported that there was broad support for the concept underlying the Design for School Excellence, i.e., that merit schools should be publicly identified; that the ten school quality indicators developed for the Design for School Excellence during 1983-84 were rated highly important by the total group and by each subgroup; that there were four top rated characteristics not currently used: quality of teaching/administrative staff, clear instructional goals, supplies/texts, equipment, and student self-image. The survey also indicated that the types of rewards to be given to merit schools were: public recognition, additional funds, and some kind of student rewards. There was somewhat less support for cash bonuses for merit school staffs.

Overall, there was a broad consensus in the Cincinnati community for implementation of the proposed Design for School Excellence Program using the existing output indicators in 1985-86.

APPENDIX A

SUMMARY OF GROUP RESPONSES TO THE
OUTPUT VARIABLES FOR THE DESIGN FOR SCHOOL EXCELLENCE
NOVEMBER, 1983 ADMINISTRATIVE WORKSHOP

SUMMARY OF GROUP RESPONSES TO THE
OUTPUT VARIABLES FOR THE DESIGN FOR SCHOOL EXCELLENCE
NOVEMBER, 1983 ADMINISTRATIVE WORKSHOP

The November Administrative Workshop at Crest Hills included a presentation by the Ad Hoc Committee on Output Variables for the Design for School Excellence. After the presentation the administrators met in small groups to respond to seven statements developed by the Ad Hoc Committee to further discussion and understanding of these variables and to obtain information for the committee. The following summarizes the 33 group response sheets that were returned to the Ad Hoc Committee. For each statement a tally of the mutiple responses and a summary of the open-ended responses is given. Some comments written on the response sheet under a specific statement either did not relate to that statement, or were so general that for clarity's sake they have been summarized at the end of the seven statements. (A typed copy of all responses made, verbatim from the response sheet, is available from the Evaluation Branch.)

A. Identification of merit includes both status and gain criteria for each output.

15 Acceptable

17 Acceptable, with consideration

0 Not acceptable; problem

1 No response

The checked responses were exclusively acceptable, or acceptable with consideration. In the written responses the most common were expressions stating that for any output a school should be able to obtain "merit" by either status or gain. Among the responses were statements that consideration should also be given to constraints that may influence certain outputs; such as student mobility on achievement, or the adjustment of staff attendance to consider maternity, long-term illnesses, etc.

B. Identification of merit includes two-year requirement of meeting criteria.

13 Acceptable

15 Acceptable, with consideration

4 Not acceptable; problem

1 No response

The overall responses were dominantly acceptable, or acceptable with consideration. The written concerns were about evenly distributed between those who felt there should be some recognition at one year to "provide impetus for additional gains," and those who felt that there should be at least a two-year requirement. Only three responses spoke to the need to use the longer period to "minimize the operation of chance," or control for "cheating" on some outputs.

C. Outputs be grouped into Achievement Measures (Reading, Mathematics, and Writing); Attendance Measures (Staff, Students); Attitude/LSAC Identified Measures (Interracial Understanding, Discipline, Attitude Towards School of Teachers, Parents, and Students).

8 Acceptable

22 Acceptable, with consideration

2 Not acceptable; problem

1 No response

Again the overall responses were dominantly acceptable, or acceptable with consideration. The written responses were very diverse. Most of these responses expressed concerns about the specific outputs and the adequacy of the defined measures. Of the 26 written comments, ten were in regard to the attitudinal measures. The concerns with the SIS attitudinal measures were: the time of year they are administered, the small number of returns by some schools, anticipated lack of reliability of these attitudinal measures, and the reactive nature to items that are used year after year. Eight of the written responses were in regard to the attendance outputs. These were mainly on the need to adjust staff attendance to consider long-term illnesses, jury duty, maternity, etc. There was also concern that for student attendance an adjustment be made to include effects of inclement weather and disruption of transportation, and that kindergarten should not be included. Three of the written comments expressed the concern of making certain that LSAC involvement is clearly defined. (There were numerous comments made regarding LSAC involvement on a later item. See F on page 3.)

D. Report of output measures and merit identification be a part of Annual Progress Report.

27 Acceptable

4 Acceptable, with consideration

1 Not acceptable; problem

0 No response

This was overwhelmingly marked acceptable. Only four response sheets had written comments about this concern. It was expressed that the output measures and merit identification be made available to schools, but that it not be made mandatory that all these data be in the school's annual report. Approved, "as long as it isn't duplicate work."

E. Reading and Mathematics standardized acheivement measure and student attendance measures are mandatory for identification of merit.

17 Acceptable

13 Acceptable, with consideration

2 Not acceptable; problem

1 No response

Again acceptable, or acceptable with consideration were the dominant responses. There were 13 rather short written comments. Six of the comments were in regard to adding other of the listed outputs as mandatory. Staff Attendance and Writing were the outputs named.

F. LSAC[1] involved in selection of additional outputs beyond required achievement and attendance measures.

7 Acceptable

17 Acceptable, with consideration

8 Not acceptable; problem

1 No response

Although the responses were still mainly acceptable, or acceptable with consideration, it was the statement regarding LSAC involvement that obtained the greatest negative response from the groups. Eight of the 33 groups indicated this to be "Not acceptable; problem." The written comments would indicate that if any LSAC involvement is undertaken, it should be carefully defined; and LSAC outputs should be something that can be measured across the school system and not so unique that criteria cannot readily be established.

In some comments suggestions were made to have LSAC involvement be through the Superintendent's Citywide LSAC Committee; or in some manner, "Let LSAC communicate their desires to administration."

[1]Local School Advisory Committee

G. A base year of performance be established so that theoretically all schools across time could attain merit.

24 Acceptable

9 Acceptable, with consideration

0 Not acceptable; problem

0 No response

All responses were either acceptable, or acceptable with consideration. The few (ten) written comments were mainly suggestions pertaining to using the averages of two or three years to obtain the baseline data; and suggestions as to what year(s) to use for the base data, i.e., "Use the last two years," and/or use data for the "...three years preceding implementation."

H. Other considerations or problems.

This space on the response sheet was made available for the groups to indicate any other consideration or problem that they felt should be expressed. A number of the responses were concerns being restated from earlier portions of the response sheet, i.e., problems of measurement, adequacy of SIS survey items, involvement of LSAC, merit should be obtained by either status or gain, etc.

In addition to this reiteration were expressions of concern in other areas. Special Education: "What do we intend to do with Special Ed and special schools...?" "Where does merit in Special Ed get recognized?" Alternative vs Neighborhood: "Alternative/neighborhood schools may not be comparable..." "Will the Design for School Excellence change alternative school strategies for recruiting?" Thruput (?): "Consideration (of other) factors having impact on outputs...," "SES status of schools and communities...," "Staffing patterns and experience..." Additional Outputs: "Unobtrusive measures...use of library, # of grievances, reported accidents...enrollment in art, music, speech, etc." "Need criterion-referenced tests for subjects other than reading and mathematics...achievement testing needed in major academic areas..."

Summary Statement

There was general support by the administrative staff to the seven statements presented by the Ad Hoc Committee on Output Factors at the November Administrative Workshop. The most negative response was with regard to LSAC involvement. These responses would indicate LSAC involvement must be carefully defined. The numerous concerns and problems identified by the administrative team must be strongly considered in development of the output component of the Design for School Excellence Model.

APPENDIX B

ILLUSTRATION OF COMMUNITY SURVEY
DESIGN FOR SCHOOL EXCELLENCE

COMMUNITY SURVEY
DESIGN FOR SCHOOL EXCELLENCE

It is important that our public school system be responsive to the needs of the entire community, not just those with children in the schools. Before responding, we would like you to give some information that would allow the results of this survey to be analyzed according to various groups.

Date:_____ Race: Black (_), White (_), Other (_) Your Age: Under 18 Years (_), 18-24 Years (_), 25-39 Years (_), 40-55 Years (_), Above 55 Years (_)

Group with whom you are completing this survey: _____

Do you have school-age children? No (_), Yes (_): Elementary (_), Junior High (_), Senior High (_)

If yes, are they enrolled in Cincinnati Public Schools? Yes (_), No (_)

PART ONE

What makes up educational excellence? What information would be most important to you if you wanted to identify an excellent school?

Below are listed characteristics that relate to schools. Rate, by checking the appropriate number, how important you think information about each of the characteristics would be in identifying excellent schools.

Rate by Checking (✓)

1 = of no importance; information not needed
2 = of minimal importance
3 = of some potential use
4 = of considerable importance
5 = of maximum importance; absolutely necessary

	Degree of Importance None 1	2	3	4	Maximum 5
I. Achievement/Performance					
a. Basic Skills (Reading, Writing, Arithmetic)	___	___	___	___	___
b. Physical Education	___	___	___	___	___
c. Social Studies (History, Civics, Economics, etc.)	___	___	___	___	___
d. Languages (French, German, Spanish, Latin, etc.)	___	___	___	___	___
e. Art and Music	___	___	___	___	___
f. Sciences (Biology, Zoology, Chemistry, Physics, etc.)	___	___	___	___	___
g. Vocational Subjects	___	___	___	___	___
h. Social Skills	___	___	___	___	___
i. Language Arts (Grammar, Literature, etc.)	___	___	___	___	___
j. Other Achievement/Performance _____					
II. Attendance/Participation					
a. Student Attendance	___	___	___	___	___
b. Teacher and Administrative Attendance	___	___	___	___	___
c. Low Dropout Rates	___	___	___	___	___
d. Racial Balance	___	___	___	___	___
e. Parent/Community Support of School	___	___	___	___	___
f. Post-Graduation Employment/College Enrollment	___	___	___	___	___
g. Other Attendance/Participation _____					
III. Attitudes					
a. Students' Attitude Toward Their School	___	___	___	___	___
b. Parents' Attitude Toward Their School	___	___	___	___	___
c. Interracial Understanding	___	___	___	___	___
d. Teachers' Attitude Toward Their School	___	___	___	___	___
e. Self Image of Students	___	___	___	___	___
f. Discipline	___	___	___	___	___
g. Interpersonal Relationships	___	___	___	___	___
h. Other Attitudes _____					
IV. Conditions					
a. Clear Instructional Goals	___	___	___	___	___
b. Supplies, Texts, Equipment	___	___	___	___	___
c. Maintenance of School Building and Grounds	___	___	___	___	___
d. Quality of Teachers & Administrative Staff	___	___	___	___	___
e. Extra-Curricular Offerings	___	___	___	___	___

(OVER)

IV. Conditions (Cont.)	Degree of Importance None 1	2	3	4	Maximum 5
f. Concentration on Academic/Vocational Learning Time	___	___	___	___	___
g. Teacher and Administrator Rewards and Incentives	___	___	___	___	___
h. Student Rewards and Incentives	___	___	___	___	___
i. High Expectations for Students	___	___	___	___	___
j. High Expectations for Total School Staff	___	___	___	___	___
k. Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress	___	___	___	___	___
l. Frequent Monitoring of Instructional Progress	___	___	___	___	___
m. Staff Inservice Training	___	___	___	___	___
n. Frequent Monitoring of Administrative Staff	___	___	___	___	___
o. Teacher Involvement in Instructional Decisions	___	___	___	___	___
p. Other Conditions _____					

PART TWO

1. The Design for School Excellence would identify schools with excellent performance on important educational indicators. These schools would be designated as "merit schools." Below are several reasons for or against the concept of identifying merit schools. Read each of these reasons and check whether you agree or disagree with them. Be careful in marking your responses, because one statement may be for and the following statement against the concept of merit schools.

Rate by Checking (✓):

Strongly Agree (SA)
Agree (A)
Undecided (U)
Disagree (D)
Strongly Disagree (SD)

I believe identifying merit schools will:	Strongly Agree (SA)	Agree (A)	Undecided (U)	Disagree (D)	Strongly Disagree (SD)
1. Provide motivation for improvement	___	___	___	___	___
2. Help set important goals for individual schools	___	___	___	___	___
3. Discourage low performing schools	___	___	___	___	___
4. Cause hard feelings between schools	___	___	___	___	___
5. Increase community support for schools	___	___	___	___	___
6. Unfairly point to differences among schools	___	___	___	___	___
7. Give positive reinforcement for desirable performance	___	___	___	___	___
8. Cause schools not recognized to give up trying	___	___	___	___	___
9. Cause unnecessary pressure and stress on schools	___	___	___	___	___
10. Reward excellence	___	___	___	___	___
11. Provide direction for improving individual schools	___	___	___	___	___
12. Cause certain outcomes to be over-emphasized	___	___	___	___	___

In consideration of the above and for reasons of my own, I think that (Please Check One):

___ Merit schools should be publicly identified.

___ Merit schools should not be publicly identified.

___ I am undecided.

PART THREE

1. How should merit schools be rewarded? Check one or more of the choices below. You may add additional ideas for rewarding merit schools.

Public Recognition ___

Extra Funds for School to Use as It Wishes ___

Money Bonus to the Entire School Staff (Teachers, Administrators and Custodians) ___

Student Reward (e.g. Party, Outing) ___

Other: _____

_____

EVALUATION BRANCH
CINCINNATI PUBLIC SCHOOLS
230 EAST NINTH STREET
CINCINNATI, OHIO 45202

EB/2-4-85

APPENDIX C

SURVEY DISTRIBUTION AND RESPONSE DATA

RETURN RATE

GROUPS	SENT	RETURNED	%
Students (11th Grade)	2,900	958	33%
Parents	18,100	4,014	22%
Teachers	3,091	1,351	44%
Field Administrators	138	73	53%
Central Office	205	128	62%
Community Sample	2,000	234	12%
Council of PTA's	Same as ret.	15	100%
District Advisory Council - Chapter 1	Same as ret.	33	100%
Leadership Cincinnati	70	26	37%
LSAC Members	600	174	29%
Survey Requests	Same as ret.	5	100%
Urban League	200	10	5%
Northside Community Council	n/a	2	---
West End Community Council	n/a	1	---
Avondale Community Council	n/a	2	---
Evanston Community Council	n/a	1	---
North Avondale Montessori	n/a	0	---
Pleasant Ridge Community Council	n/a	13	---
UCAA Downtown Club	Same as ret.	14	100%
UC Students	Same as ret.	72	100%
TOTALS	27,896	7,395	27%